

March 1, 2000

The Honorable Terry Geiger, Chairperson  
House Appropriations Committee  
House Office Building - N1191  
Lansing, MI 48913

The Honorable Harry Gast, Chairperson  
Senate Appropriations Committee  
State Capitol Building  
Lansing, MI 48913

Gentlemen:

In addition to boilerplate reports previously submitted under separate cover, the following reports are required by March 1 pursuant to Public Act 92 of 1999:

Section 307(4)	Technical Probation Violators
Section 804(1)	OCC Information (part of biannual report)
Section 809(8)	OCC Probation Detention Centers Impact Report

Section 307(4) - During the past year, the Department has continued to promote use of electronic monitoring, corrections center, SAI and TRV placement, residential and outpatient substance abuse treatment for appropriate technical parole and probation violators. There were no new policy directives targeting parole/probation violators initiated by the Department during the past year. The policy that was forwarded to you last year which was effective April 1, 1999 is still in effect.

Section 804(1) - The Office of Community Corrections' biannual report is attached for your review, however, reliable Basic Information Report data is not available at this time. Once that information is available, it will be forwarded.

Section 809(8) - We have been informed by the Program Administrator that the required information has been compiled and forwarded to this office. It will be sent to you and the other parties pursuant to this section as soon as it is received.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Roy G. Piggott, Administrator  
Bureau of Fiscal Management

cc: Senator Walter North  
Representative Charles LaSata  
Karen Firestone, Senate Fiscal Agency  
Shannon Pike, DMB Budget

Marilyn Peterson, House Fiscal Agency  
Mary Lannoye, State Budget Director  
William Overton, Deputy Director, A/P

**BI-ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**  
**PURSUANT TO**  
**PUBLIC ACT NO. 511 OF 1988, SECTION 12(2)**  
**AND**  
**PUBLIC ACT NO. 92 OF 1999, SECTION 804**

March 2000

Prepared By:  
Office of Community Corrections

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bi-Annual Report .....	1
Introduction .....	3
Local Government Participation .....	6
Prison Admissions, Jail Utilization, and Program Utilization .....	7
FY 2000 Awards of Funds .....	9
Community Corrections Plans and Services .....	10
Probation Residential Services .....	13

## REQUIREMENT FOR BI-ANNUAL REPORT

This report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of Section 12(2) of Public Act No. 511 of 1988 and Section 804 of P.A. 92 of 1999, which state:

Sec. 12. (2) of P.A. 511

(2) The office shall submit a biannual report not later than March 1 and September 1 of each year, detailing the effectiveness of the programs and plans funded under this act, including an explanation of how the rate of commitment of prisoners to the state prison system has been affected by the programs and plans funded under this act and listing any instances of noncompliance as required under section 5(b).

Section 804 of P.A. 92 of 1999

Sec. 804. (1) As part of the March biannual report specified under section 12(2) of the community corrections act, 1988 PA 511, MCL 791.412, which requires an analysis of the impact of that act on prison admissions and jail utilization, the department shall submit to the senate and house appropriations subcommittees on corrections, the senate and house fiscal agencies, and the state budget director the following information for each county and counties consolidated for comprehensive corrections plans:

- (a) Approved technical assistance grants and comprehensive corrections plans including each program and level of funding, the utilization level of each program, and profile information of enrolled offenders.
- (b) If federal funds are made available, the number of participants funded, the number served, the number successfully completing the program, and a summary of the program activity.
- (c) Status of the community corrections information system and the jail population information system.
- (d) Data on probation residential centers, including participant data, participant sentencing guidelines scores, program expenditures, average length of stay, and bed utilization data.
- (e) Offender disposition data by sentencing guideline range, by disposition type, number and percent statewide and by county, current year, and comparisons to prior 3 years.

(2) The report required under subsection (1) shall include the total funding allocated, program expenditures, required program data, and year-to-date totals.

(3) It is the intent of the legislature that the funds appropriated in section 110 for public education and training be fully expended. To this end, the department shall submit by October 15, 1999 to the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on corrections plans for public education grants to communities and yearly training in cooperation with local community corrections advisory boards based on full expenditure of the funds appropriated in section 110 for public education and training.

The primary focus of this report as prepared is on the awards of FY 2000 Comprehensive Plans and Services and Probation Residential Services funds. This report will be updated as felony disposition and other data/information from local jurisdictions and other sources becomes available.

## INTRODUCTION

The Office of Community Corrections, including the State Community Corrections Board, was created pursuant to provisions of Public Act 511 of 1988 as an autonomous agency within the Department of Corrections. Executive Order 1995-16 transferred the Office of Community Corrections to the Department of Corrections.

The Office of Community Corrections operates within Field Operations Administration working in concert with Field Operations Administration Offices, Regions, and local governments to establish and utilize community corrections programs for appropriately selected offenders, mostly probationers. This partnership works together to reduce admissions to prison of nonviolent offenders, improve utilization of jail facilities, improve rehabilitative services for offenders, and strengthen offender accountability.

### Objectives and Priorities

In order to be eligible for Community Corrections Act funding, programs work with offenders who: are bound for prison (especially with sentences of less than 24 months) or bound for jail without program intervention, and have not demonstrated a pattern of violent behavior or do not have a criminal record which indicates a pattern of violent offenses.

On February 25, 1999, the State Community Corrections Board recommended the adoption of the following priorities for the balance of Fiscal Year 1999 and for Fiscal Year 2000. This action was taken to: address the new statutory guidelines and other legislation; and strengthen the focus of state and local community corrections policy, practice, and programming on treatment effect and recidivism reduction. The priorities were subsequently incorporated in the guidelines/instructions for the preparation of FY 2000 proposals and applications for funds by local jurisdictions, and training provided during the spring and summer of 1999 and during the September Michigan Community Corrections Conference.

### Prison Admissions

- Reduce or maintain low prison admissions for: a) offenders with sentencing guidelines which are within the “straddle cells”; b) probation violators; and c) parole violators.
- Offenders within the presumptive prison group are not to be targeted as a group, but jurisdictions are encouraged to examine use of local sentencing options on a case by case basis.
- Emphases are on use of jail and other community based sanctions and services for all offenders within “straddle cells” and creative use of jail time for these offenders.

- Focusing on probation violators as a priority population responds to three factors: 1) technical violations are not addressed in the statutory guidelines; 2) violators account for a large proportion of prison intake and; 3) increasingly, state and local jurisdictions will need to examine the impacts of the total sentence and supervision plan on resources (initial disposition as well as responses to violations).
- A priority on parole violators has been established considering: 1) parole violators have always been a target population for community corrections; 2) Community Corrections funded services have been utilized for parole violators only on a limited basis; and 3) increased utilization of the jails and non-incarcerative options for this population could reduce prison intake.

### Jail Utilization

- Priorities for jail utilization should be on use of jail beds for individuals charged with or convicted of crimes against persons and to protect public safety; to the maximum extent possible, utilization of jail beds should be restricted to higher risk cases.
- Principles established within statutory guidelines relative to the use of incarceration for felons should be incorporated within local policies and practices relative to the use of jails and other sanctions and programming for misdemeanors, ordinance violators, and individuals on pretrial status.

Local jurisdictions through the Community Corrections Plan and/or jail management policies need to establish guidelines and parameters and limits for use of jail and other community based options for all population groups.

For higher risk/need cases, jails should be utilized as a condition of probation and as part of a sentence plan which includes a short term in jail with release to other forms of supervision and/or treatment.

### Target Populations for Community Corrections Programs

- Target populations are to be restricted to higher risk/need cases (can include pretrial, misdemeanants, ordinance violators, and sentenced felons) provided specific criteria are employed. Examples of targeting criteria include but are not limited to: guideline scores, the instant offense, prior convictions, and program specific eligibility criteria.
- Jurisdictions will need to revisit and update target populations and program specific eligibility criteria for community corrections programs and update the range of sentencing options for all population groups.

- Community based supervision and treatment services are to be restricted to higher risk/need cases consistent with “what works” principles of effective intervention.
- Probation Residential Services - The current SGL criteria remain in effect; i.e., minimum maximum of 9 and minimum maximum of 6 for probation violators. This will have the effect of no change for offenders sentenced under the court guidelines and increasing the min/max for those sentenced under the statutory guidelines.

#### Sentencing Recommendation and Probation Violation Processing

- Each jurisdiction will need to review sentencing recommendation and probation violation guidelines and processes, and update response guides consistent with MDOC policies to reinforce attainment of the prison commitment, jail utilization, program utilization, and offender supervision and treatment objectives and priorities.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION**

Local governments elect to participate in the implementation of the Michigan Community Corrections Act through establishing a local Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) and developing a local comprehensive corrections plan in accordance with Sections 7 and 8 of P.A. 511 of 1988. The local comprehensive corrections plan identifies local policies and practice, and programs and services which are to be implemented to address the goals and objectives of P.A. 511, local needs, and priorities.

Since June of 1989, 80 of Michigan's 83 counties elected to participate through formulation of single county, multi-county, and city-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. Fiscal Year 1999-2000 funds were awarded to support implementation or continued operation of community-based sanctions and services in 72 counties.

## **PRISON ADMISSIONS, JAIL UTILIZATION, AND PROGRAM UTILIZATION**

The Biannual Reports provide statewide and county by county data over time. The following summarize patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization, and the utilization of community based programming.

### **Prison Commitments**

1999 Felony Disposition data per the Basic Information Reports (BIR) was not available for the preparation of this report. Therefore, the data referenced herein is for 1998 and prior years. Michigan's prison commitment rate was 32% in 1990 and 22% in 1998; the total number sentenced to prison decreased each year from 1993 to 1995, increased during 1996 and 1997 then decreased during 1998; the 1996 and 1997 admissions were less than 1993 and prior years however.

When prison commitment rates are analyzed in terms of whether the offenders had prior felony convictions, the offenders most likely to be eligible for participation in P.A. 511 funded programs (offenders with two or more prior felony convictions sentenced on non-mandatory, non-assaultive charges) had the greatest decrease in prison commitment rates from 1992 through 1995. The 1996 through and 1998 rates are comparable to 1995.

### **Jail Utilization**

During the '90s and through '98 sentenced felons accounted for an increasing percentage of jails' average daily populations. The percentage of felony offenders receiving jail sentences increased as the prison commitment rate decreased.

### **Program Utilization**

Sentenced felons have accounted for an increasing percentage of community corrections program enrollees and for the vast majority of the enrollments in "treatment" type programs--substance abuse, mental health, education and employment. Misdemeanants account for the majority of enrollments in community services programs. Utilization of Probation Residential Services continues to increase. The FY '95 Average Daily Population (ADP) was 588.9; the FY '96 ADP was 704.6; the FY '97 ADP was 771.4; the FY '98 ADP was 852; the FY '99 ADP was 865.8 and the ADP for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of FY 2000 was 892.9. Offenders with SGL minimum minimum of 12 or greater, probation violators, and OUIL offenders account for increasing proportions of new enrollees in residential programs through FY '98. This pattern continued through the first three quarters of FY '99 then began to change somewhat as increasing numbers of offenders were sentenced in accord with the provisions of the new statutory sentencing guidelines.

## **PROGRAMS**

The Office of Community Corrections has administrative responsibilities for the following:

**Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services** funds awarded to local units of government support a wide range of sanctions and services and the specific sanctions and services supported by these funds vary from community to community depending upon local needs and priorities. Per the priorities adopted in February 1999, increased emphases are being placed on improving treatment effect of programs/services supported with community corrections funds.

**Probation Residential Services** funds are utilized to purchase residential and support services for eligible felony offenders. The FY 2000 funds awarded for residential services supported an average daily population of 949. Emphases in FY 2000 are on: maintaining a utilization rate of 90% or greater among all providers of services; continued development of variable lengths of stay for different population groups; improving program quality and strengthening linkages and offender movement between PRS and other local sanctions and services.

Funding for the **County Jail Reimbursement Program (CJRP)** is included within the appropriations for the Office of Community Corrections functions. The Michigan Department of Corrections County Jail Services Unit has responsibilities for administration for the program, however.

**Relationships with Other Programs:** The planning process prescribed by the Michigan Department of Corrections Office of Community Corrections requires each Community Corrections Advisory Board to identify means by which linkages with Michigan Works agencies, the Substance Abuse Coordinating Agency, the local Community Health Departments, the local school districts, etc., can/will facilitate the cost effective provision of services to offenders and avoid or minimize duplication of services and administrative costs.

**FY 2000 AWARD OF FUNDS**

## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES FUNDS

<b>FY 2000 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$13,033,000</b>
<b>FY 2000 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$12,364,014*</b>

\*Additional awards will be made during the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarters of FY 2000. These include amendments to current awards and awards of funds to initiate programming in additional counties.

FY 2000 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds were awarded to support community-based programs in 72 counties (44 county, city/county, or multi-county CCABs).

The Plans and Services funds are utilized within local jurisdictions to support a wide range of programming options for eligible detainees and offenders. The distribution of funds among program categories is presented below.

### Resource Commitment by Program Category:

Community Service	\$1,544,684
Education	163,233
Employment/Training	360,180
Intensive Supervision	2,036,185
Mental Health	312,302
Pretrial	1,323,867
Substance Abuse	1,693,532
24 Hour Structured Supervision	41,643
Case Management	2,133,886
CCAB Administration	2,641,402
Other	113,100
Total	\$12,364,014

It is expected that the commitment of funds among program categories will change over time as increased efforts are made throughout the state to increase treatment effect.

More specifically it is expected there will, during FY 2000 and beyond, be a shifting of resource commitments to increase emphases on cognitive/behavior based and other programming for higher risk and need cases. This is in accord with the priorities adopted in February 1999 and principles and factors which research has shown contribute to improved treatment effect and reduction in recidivism.

Some of the shifting or reallocation of resources was made during the FY 2000 award of funds process as local jurisdictions moved forward with the development and implementation of new approaches to substance abuse treatment, education and employment programming, and the implementation of process and practices which are designed to improve: case planning and sanction and service matching in accord with principles of risk, need, and responsivity; case management; and monitoring and evaluating treatment effect and impacts on criminal behavior.

### **Resource Commitment by Local Jurisdiction**

The sanctions and services supported by FY 2000 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds within each local jurisdiction are identified on the attached Table entitled “FY 2000 Comprehensive Plans and Services - Budget Amounts for Program Services.”

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

PLANS AND SERVICES

BUDGETED AMOUNTS FOR PROGRAM SERVICES

FY 2000

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRETRIAL SERVICES	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	24 HOUR STRUCTURED	CASE MGMT	OTHER	ADMIN	Total
BARRY/ALLEGAN	14,000	12,000		46,227	11,438		8,275		41,704		24,000	157,644
BAY	27,500	24,000					50,820				43,000	145,320
BERRIEN				79,750					40,190		33,700	153,640
CALHOUN				91,700			20,000			51,000	49,000	211,700
CASS	5,000			9,000			21,065		18,850		21,225	75,140
CENTRAL UP	53,972			1,000						1,000	22,245	78,217
CLINTON	25,000		7,280	11,200					9,520		24,000	77,000
EASTERN UP	52,139			36,570							38,291	127,000
EATON	42,898	8,000	13,090		9,750		5,000	41,643			29,184	149,565
GENESSEE	60,000			146,500	10,000	51,000	76,500				90,000	434,000
HURON	25,970	500					24,300				16,042	66,812
INGHAM/LANSING	53,000		64,582	50,000			44,693		12,500		61,500	286,275
ISABELLA	9,000			4,200	4,200		20,460		21,500		25,458	84,818
JACKSON	48,668			42,000			43,860				55,600	190,128
KALAMAZOO	52,000		33,835	47,250	12,500	43,000	106,000		42,000		63,180	399,765
KENT	58,730		39,000	102,000	109,000	128,735	95,335		20,500		186,500	739,800
LAKE	2,500			1,500		6,000	3,049		16,000		6,000	35,049
MACOMB	34,300			45,000			161,076		234,500		104,450	579,326
MARQUETTE				15,000					48,155		26,265	89,420
MASON	5,600	2,000	1,000	5,000	1,000	5,400	4,000		18,800		9,850	52,650
MECOSTA	23,000			12,540					12,540		15,010	63,090
MIDLAND	6,700		1,000		15,408		79,252				25,364	127,724
MONROE	37,100	5,000	12,000	3,000		12,000	74,000				35,000	178,100
MONTCALM/IONIA	74,250			14,000			30,000				21,750	140,000
MUSKEGON	30,790			51,200		37,552			44,500		69,900	233,942
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	41,750		1,000		5,000		10,000		60,250		35,000	153,000
NW MICHIGAN	31,103	28,000		35,027	9,780	2,000	69,872		135,526	11,850	42,496	365,654
OAKLAND	125,000	13,000	165,568	150,000		470,602			244,527		278,434	1,447,131
OSCEOLA	32,800	1,625	1,625	2,875			2,875	1,500			6,200	49,500
OTTAWA	70,664			100,161							42,245	213,070
SAGINAW			7,000	63,000		92,108				49,250	72,225	283,583
ST. CLAIR				24,200	4,000	42,400	37,000		42,000		31,000	180,600
ST. JOSEPH		6,000		32,900	20,000						24,400	83,300
SANILAC	36,775						9,050				16,000	61,825
THIRTEENTH				74,050	10,000				72,227		17,560	173,837
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	17,922	16,408	5,200	11,187	18,026		22,200		19,557		39,500	150,000
TWENTY SIXTH CIRCUIT		10,000			67,200		6,000		9,600		25,600	118,400
THUMB	45,500		3,000	21,500	5,000	14,130	24,000				42,000	155,130
TRI COUNTY	74,850	5,000					1,000		1,420		32,130	114,400
VAN BUREN	39,703	6,500							34,200		25,856	106,259
WASTENAW/ANN ARBOR		25,200	5,000	73,170		64,370	74,860		36,200		75,800	354,600
WAYNE	100,000			610,978		351,695	570,365		897,120		673,442	3,203,600
WEST CENTRAL UP	186,500			22,500							65,000	274,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,544,684</b>	<b>163,233</b>	<b>360,180</b>	<b>2,036,185</b>	<b>312,302</b>	<b>1,323,867</b>	<b>1,693,532</b>	<b>41,643</b>	<b>2,133,886</b>	<b>113,100</b>	<b>2,641,402</b>	<b>12,364,014</b>
<b>PERCENT OF TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>12.49%</b>	<b>1.32%</b>	<b>2.91%</b>	<b>16.47%</b>	<b>2.53%</b>	<b>10.71%</b>	<b>13.70%</b>	<b>0.34%</b>	<b>17.26%</b>	<b>0.91%</b>	<b>21.36%</b>	

APPROPRIATION: \$13,033,000.00  
 AWARD: \$12,364,014.00

**CCAB INCLUDES COUNTIES OF:**  
 CENTRAL UPPER PENINSULA ALGER, SCHOOLCRAFT  
 EASTERN UPPER PENINSULA CHIPPEWA, LUCE, MACKINAC  
 NORTHERN MICHIGAN CHEBOYGAN, CRAWFORD, OTSEGO  
 NORTHWEST MICHIGAN BENZIE, CHARLEVOIX, EMMET, KALKASKA, MANISTEE, WEXFORD  
 THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT ANTRIM, GRAND TRAVERSE, LEELANAU  
 THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT ARENAC, OGEMAW, ROSCOMMON  
 THUMB REGIONAL LAPEER, TUSCOLA  
 TRI COUNTY BARAGA, HOUGHTON, KEWEENAW  
 TWENTY SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT ALCONA, ALPENA, MONTMORENCY, PRESQUE ISLE  
 WEST CENTRAL UPPER PENINSULA DELTA, DICKINSON, GOGEBIC, IRON, MENOMINEE, ONTONAGON

## PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

<b>FY 2000 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$14,934,600</b>
<b>FY 2000 Award to Funds</b>	<b>\$14,931,492</b>

FY 2000 funds were awarded to support residential services pursuant to 29 local comprehensive corrections plans. This compares to 13 in FY '94, 18 in FY '95 and FY '96, 27 in FY '97, and 28 in FY '98 and FY '99. The FY 2000 awards respond to utilization patterns among local jurisdictions and create greater capabilities for local jurisdictions to purchase residential services for eligible felony offenders from a wider range of providers.

During FY '99, emphases continued to be on: utilizing residential services as part of a continuum of sanctions and services (e.g., short-term residential substance abuse treatment services followed by outpatient treatment as appropriate, residential services followed by day reporting); reducing the length of stay in residence; and increasing the utilization of short term residential services for probation violators.

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

**PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES**

**AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION**

CCAB	FY 1998			FY 1999			FY 2000		
	CONTRACT AMOUNT	AUTHORIZED ADP	ADP	CONTRACT AMOUNT	AUTHORIZED ADP	ADP	CONTRACT AMOUNT	AUTHORIZED ADP	1st Quarter ADP
Allegan/Barry	51,770	4	2.78	73,000	5	4.42	78,690	5	1.62
Bay	69,350	5	4.30	73,000	5	4.18	78,690	5	6.37
Berrien	165,806	12	11.08	197,800	14	12.63	236,070	15	19.05
Calhoun	307,360	21	17.20	277,400	19	10.91	330,498	21	20.41
Eaton	21,120	4	3.66	58,400	4	2	62,952	4	3.99
Genesee	1,088,136	75	75.09	1,095,000	75	68.25	1,133,136	72	91.52
Ingham/City of Lansing	537,606	37	35.10	540,200	37	29.03	550,830	35	32.55
Jackson	156,310	11	9.65	175,200	12	10.71	283,284	18	14.29
Kalamazoo	1,307,412	91	89.31	1,314,000	90	88.73	1,412,550	90	84.34
Kent	1,459,248	101	85.02	1,357,800	88	78.11	1,416,420	90	85.01
Macomb PRC	357,284	25	24.62	387,900	27	26.14	440,664	28	27.16
Marquette	34,480	2	1.77	43,800	3	1.16	31,476	2	1.11
Midland	67,126	5	4.31	73,000	5	3.83	62,952	4	4.53
Monroe	69,350	5	3.76	77,000	5	4.74	314,760	20	3.42
Muskegon	592,797	41	33.70	525,600	36	26.82	566,568	36	39.74
Northern Michigan***	30,740	2	2.31	43,800	3	2.43	47,214	3	2.13
Northwest Michigan***	111,390	8	5.87	102,200	7	5.35	110,166	7	6.93
Oakland SAI-CPI	986,150 25,960	68	67.69 3.01	1,312,175	90	84.85	1,416,420	90	75.48
Ottawa	76,050	5	4.95	88,200	6	5.12	94,428	6	2.03
Saginaw	716,292	50	46.82	730,000	50	47.62	786,900	50	49.28
St. Clair	643,706	45	40.89	595,000	41	40.04	629,520	40	41.58
St. Joseph	582,540	40	38.46	627,200	43	42.37	660,996	42	43.86
Thirty Fourth Circuit***	41,610	3	2.42	43,800	3	2.82	47,214	3	1.42
Thirteenth Circuit***	119,362	8	8.12	131,400	9	7.52	141,642	9	9.11
Twenty Sixth Circuit***	75,724	5	4.06	87,600	6	3.27	62,952	4	3.25
Van Buren							47,214	3	2.40
Washtenaw	375,730	26	22.67	408,800	28	22.26	440,664	28	30.52
Wayne	3,552,700	246	201.44	3,343,400	229	227.04	3,399,408	216	185.11
West Central U.P.***	52,423	4	1.48	58,400	4	3.42	47,214	3	4.67
<b>PRS TOTALS</b>	<b>13,675,532</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>851.54</b>	<b>13,841,075</b>	<b>944</b>	<b>865.77</b>	<b>14,931,492</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>892.88</b>

**\*\*\*NOTE:**

CCAB	<b>INCLUDES COUNTIES OF:</b>
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	Cheyboygan, Crawford, Otsego
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN REGIONAL	Benzie, Charlevoix, Emmet, Kalkaska, Manistee, Missaukee, Wexford
THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT	Antrim, Grand Traverse, Leelanau
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	Arenac, Ogemaw, Roscommon
TWENTY SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT	Alcona, Alpena, Montmorency, Presque Isle
WEST CENTRAL UPPER PENINSULA REG.	Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Iron, Menominee, Ontonagon